

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 11-17 are currently pending with Claims 1, 6, 8 and 13 being independent claims and the remaining claims (Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12 and 14-17) being dependent claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming a program but not defining the program to be encoded on a memory/disk/computer-readable medium.

Claims 13-17 have been amended to recite a computer-readable medium. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection has been overcome.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Moyer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 20040010567) (hereinafter, "Moyer et al.").

The invention defined in Claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, the following features:

- (1) receiving a printing request from the client device;
- (2) transmitting print data to the printer device in accordance with the received printing request; and
- (3) transmitting, to the client device, information for causing the client device to acquire a state of processing of the transmitted print data.

According to the invention defined in Claim 1 that has the above features (1) – (3), for example, it is possible that the client device acquires the state of the processing of the print data by using the information transmitted from the server when a printing request is transmitted from the client device to the server and the print data is transmitted from the server to a printer device in accordance with the printing request.

On the other hand, the Moyer et al. reference discloses that a server transmits a response including print data to a printer device, in response to a

request from the printer device. the Moyer et al. reference further discloses that the server receives a notification of print completion from the printer device after printing the print data by the printer device in which the response has been received.

The Moyer et al. reference discloses that the server communicates with the printer device via the network but fails to disclose that the server communicates with the client device. Therefore, the server disclosed in the Moyer et al. reference cannot transmit the information for acquiring the state of the processing of the print data, to the client device. That is to say, the Moyer et al. reference is silent as to the feature (3).

Because the cited and applied reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent Claim 1, independent Claim 1 is believed allowable.

Independent Claims 8 and 13 include similar features to those discussed above with reference to Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 13 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

The invention defined in Claim 6 includes, *inter alia*, the following features:

- (4) receiving a printing request from a Web browser of the client device;
- (5) transmitting print data to the printer device in accordance with the received printing request;
- (6) acquiring a Web page indicating a state of processing of the transmitted print data, the Web page being provided by the printer device; and
- (7) transmitting, to the client device, the acquired Web page.

According to the invention defined in Claim 6 that has the above features (4) – (7), for example it is possible that the client device obtains the state of the processing of the print data by using the Web page transmitted from the server when a printing request is transmitted from the Web browser of the client device to the server and the print data is transmitted from the server to the printer device in accordance with the printing request.

On the other hand, as discussed above, the Moyer et al. reference fails to disclose that the server communicates with the client device via the network. Therefore, the server disclosed in the Moyer et al. reference cannot transmit, to

the client device, the Web page indicating the state of the processing of the print data transmitted from the server. The Moyer et al. reference fails to suggest that the Web page to be transmitted to the client device is acquired from the printer device. That is to say, the Moyer et al. reference is silent to the feature (6) and (7).

Because the cited and applied reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent Claim 6, independent Claim 6 is believed allowable.

The remaining claims (Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12 and 14-17) are dependent claims. Because the independent claims are all believed allowable, as described above, all of the claims depending therefrom are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to the independent claims. Furthermore, each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

All of the Pending Claims Are Allowable

As described above, all of the pending claims include features not in the cited and applied reference.

Furthermore, all of the features of the claims as amended are supported by the application as filed and no new matter has been added as discussed in further detail below.

Features of the preamble of Claims 1, 8 and 13 are provided, for example, in paragraphs [0031] to [0036] and Fig 1.

The reception feature recited in Claims 1, 8 and 13 is provided, for example, in paragraphs [0049] to [0051] and Fig 5.

The first transmission feature recited in Claims 1, 8 and 13 is provided, for example, in paragraphs [0058] to [0059] and Fig. 7.

The second transmission feature recited in Claims 1, 8 and 13 is provided, for example, in paragraph [0055] and Fig. 5.

A feature defined in the preamble of Claim 6 is supported by the descriptions in the paragraphs [0031] to [0036] and Fig 1, for example.

Features of the preamble of Claim 6 are provided, for example, in paragraphs [0069] to [0071] and Fig 10.

The first transmission feature recited in Claim 6 is provided, for example, in paragraphs [0075] to [0076] and Fig. 10.

The acquisition feature recited in Claim 6 is provided, for example, in paragraph [0079] and Fig. 12.

The second transmission feature recited in Claim 6 is provided, for example, in paragraph [0083] and Fig. 12.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact
Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

March 11, 2008

/Marlene Klein/

Date

Marlene Klein, Reg. No. 43,718
Patent Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3132
Fax: (949) 932-3560